IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

REVIEW PETITION NO. 18 OF 2006
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 117 OF 2006

M/s. Ekta Enterprises ... Petitioner

V/s.

The Collector, Mumbai & Ors. ... Respondent

Mr. A.V. Chatuphale for the petitioner.
Mr. S.P. Salkar for the respondent No.1.
Mr. P.M. Palshikar, AGP for respondent No.1.

CORAM : F.I. REBELLO,
ANOOP V. MOHTA,JJ.
DATED : 29th March, 2006

P.C.

. We have heard Counsel at length and called for the records of the Writ Petition. Grievance of the review applicant is that he has paid the amount and inspite of that he has been called upon to pay further amount as set out in the impugned order. From the order, it is clear that the petitioner chose not to remain present though notice has been given to him. On behalf of Mandal Shri Sahebrao Jaiswal of Group No. 84-B was examined. His statement was recorded that employer was not paying the entire amount and was not depositing the same with the Mandal and threatened to stop giving work to the group.

2. The books of the establishment were examined by the Inspector who had visited the establishment. Show Cause Notices were issued. No reply was filed to the same.

3. After the petition was filed, reply came to be filed on behalf of respondents herein reiterating that the amount had not been paid. There was no rejoinder filed thereto.

4. Present petition is for review of our order dated 6th March, 2006. The only submission made for review is that amounts have been paid.

5. In our view considering the material on record before the authority and the finding recorded and the reply filed before this Court, no interference is called for. The order does not disclose any error of law apparent on the face of the record. Hence, review application rejected.

[F.I. REBELLO, J.]

[ANOOP V. MOHTA, J.]